

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 284, THE  
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL  
YEAR 1999

---

JUNE 3, 1998.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules,  
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany 455]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 455, by a non-record vote, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION

The resolution provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 284, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1999, under a modified closed rule. The rule provides three hours of general debate with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, including one hour on economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton and Representative Stark. The rule further provides for consideration as an original resolution for the purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of this report.

The rule also makes in order only those amendments in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of this report to be offered only in the order specified, only by the Member designated, debatable for one hour each and not be subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments except that if an amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes.

The rule allows for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the concurrent resolution, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. The rule also permits the Chairman of the Budget Committee to offer amendments in the

House to achieve mathematical consistency pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Budget Act. Finally, the rule suspends the application of House Rule XLIX (relating to the establishment of the statutory limit on the public debt) with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

#### COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to clause 2(1)(2)(B) of House rule XI the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and against, are printed below:

#### RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 91

Date: June 3, 1998.

Measure: H. Con. Res. 284, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1999.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: To make in order the Minge amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Results: Defeated 1 to 7.

Vote by Member: Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Hastings—Nay; Myrick—Nay; Frost—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

#### SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER BY THE RULE TO H. CON. RES. 284, THE BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FY 1999

Neuman: Substitute amendment that limits government spending growth to slightly less than the rate of inflation; provides \$150 billion in tax relief; protects Social Security by placing negotiable Treasury bonds in the Social Security Trust Fund and guaranteeing their value at redemption; creates a Social Security “lock box” to dedicate cuts made during the consideration of appropriation bills to preserving Social Security; increases spending for national defense by \$56 billion over last year’s balanced budget agreement; designates 50% of any additional revenues collected by the federal government towards tax relief and the other 50% towards paying off the national debt; calls for changes in the PAYGO budget rule; and contains numerous Sense of the House provisions.

Spratt: Substitute amendment that funds the Presidents initiatives such as day care and the “patient bill of rights”; reserves all budget surpluses until Congress and the President agree on a resolution to Social Security’s long-run solvency; eliminates provisions for a tax cut; funds transportation at the levels of H.R. 2400; established a reserve fund for potential tobacco legislation; and includes various Sense of Congress provisions.

#### PART 1

The amendment in the nature of a substitute considered as an original concurrent resolution:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### **SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999

and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,292,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,318,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,331,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,358,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,407,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,452,600,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$0.

Fiscal year 1999: −\$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: −\$10,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: −\$21,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: −\$28,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: −\$37,800,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,359,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,443,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,477,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,502,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,571,200,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,343,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,401,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,435,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,463,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,473,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,540,700,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$50,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$83,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$104,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$105,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$65,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$88,100,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,436,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,597,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,777,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,957,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$6,102,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$6,269,400,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$267,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$268,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$270,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$274,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$267,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$280,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$269,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$288,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$1,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$6,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$6,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,500,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$24,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$20,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$10,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$10,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$4,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$46,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$44,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$40,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$40,600,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$61,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$56,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$61,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$60,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$62,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$62,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$65,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$63,900,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$136,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$132,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$143,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$142,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$149,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$149,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$155,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$155,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$162,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$163,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$171,200,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$172,000,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$199,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$199,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$210,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$211,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$221,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$221,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$239,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$242,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$251,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$248,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$273,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$273,700,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$229,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$234,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$243,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$247,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$255,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$265,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$264,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$274,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$271,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$284,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$280,400,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.



- (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$42,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$42,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$290,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$290,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$296,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$297,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$297,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$296,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$296,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$298,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$298,500,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$14,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$14,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$2,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$3,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$2,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$3,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$3,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,200,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$36,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$36,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$36,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$36,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$36,100,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, – \$36,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, – \$38,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, – \$38,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, – \$45,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, – \$45,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, – \$35,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, – \$35,900,000,000.

#### **SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 26, 1998, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$30,400,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$157,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: – \$8,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and – \$35,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$417,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$2,437,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$18,700,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$100,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$71,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$384,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of

direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$5,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$26,500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(7) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$16,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$78,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$23,800,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$125,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(9) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$411,100,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$2,374,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,278,500,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1999 and \$6,637,700,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

#### **SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

#### **SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the trustees of the social security trust funds, should consider issuing marketable interest-bearing securities to the trust funds for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

#### **SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 47 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment in lieu of traditional income support and to

assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;

(4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered to encourage low-income individuals and families to accumulate assets through contributions to individual development accounts as a means of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

**SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.**

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered that provides medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

**SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there is concern that the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies;

(2) the Administration should ensure that the implementation of the interim payment system does not adversely affect the availability of home health services for medicare beneficiaries;

(3) Congress should carefully examine the Administration's implementation of the home health payment system and make any necessary changes to ensure that the needs of medicare beneficiaries are being met; and

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should quickly implement the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) Federal courts have found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution;

(2) Congress responded to these court decisions by enacting the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure free and appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

(3) IDEA authorizes the Federal Government to provide 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(4) the Federal Government has not fully funded IDEA at its authorized levels; and

(5) if the Federal Government fully funds IDEA, then local school districts will have the flexibility to invest in new technology, hire additional teachers, and purchase books and supplies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should fully fund programs authorized under IDEA and that such funding is of the highest priority among Federal education programs.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUDGETARY RULES AND TAX CUTS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1990, pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirements were enacted to prevent Congress and the President from increasing the deficit;

(2) under PAYGO requirements, tax legislation must be offset by legislation increasing revenues or reducing entitlement spending;

(3) these requirements prevent Congress from offsetting tax cuts with discretionary savings or budget surpluses;

(4) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will produce the first surplus in the unified budget in 29 years;

(5) under current trends, the Federal Government could run an on-budget surplus (which excludes social security and the postal service) as early as fiscal year 1999; and

(6) while these requirements were useful during a period of chronic deficit spending, they now limit the ability of Congress to allow taxpayers to retain more of their own money.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the reconciliation bill to be considered pursuant to the reconciliation instructions in section 4—

(1) should permit discretionary savings to be used to offset tax cuts; and

(2) may make on-budget surpluses available to offset tax cuts.

**SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.**

It is the sense of Congress that the revenue levels set forth in this resolution are predicated on—

(1) eliminating the marriage penalty over an appropriate period of time; and

(2) providing tax relief targeted at relieving the tax burden on families, estates, and wages, as well as incentives to stimulate job creation and economic growth.

**PART 2**

**1. AN AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE NEUMANN OF WISCONSIN, OR A DESIGNEE, DEBATABLE FOR 60 MINUTES**

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

## TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

### SECTION 101. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

### SEC. 102. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,304,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,314,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,348,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,399,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,452,300,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: –\$18,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: –\$27,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: –\$31,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: –\$36,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: –\$38,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,385,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,409,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,448,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,426,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,545,600,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,377,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,401,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,433,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,443,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,513,100,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$73,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$87,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$85,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$43,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$60,800,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,596,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,777,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,957,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$6,102,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$6,269,300,000,000.

**SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$278,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$273,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$283,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$277,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$289,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$315,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$297,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$324,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$306,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.



- (B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$1,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$1,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$2,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$6,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$6,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$1,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,100,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$19,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$18,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$9,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$45,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$48,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$46,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$50,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$47,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$51,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$48,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$53,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$50,100,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$58,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$59,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$59,400,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,000,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$139,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$137,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$141,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$141,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$144,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$144,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$147,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$152,400,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$210,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$220,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$219,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$240,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$246,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$270,400,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$236,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$240,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$254,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$254,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$214,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$259,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,300,000,000.

- (14) Social Security (650):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$42,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$21,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$244,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$244,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$238,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$238,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$230,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$230,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$223,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$223,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$217,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$217,400,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$3,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$4,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$4,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$9,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$9,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$9,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$6,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$6,000,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$44,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$44,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$44,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$44,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$46,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$46,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$54,600,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, –\$54,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, –\$46,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, –\$46,300,000,000.

## **TITLE II—SENSE OF HOUSE PROVISIONS**

### **SEC. 201. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY.**

- (a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:
  - (1) The social security program currently collects more in taxes than it pays out in benefits to our country’s senior citizens.
  - (2) Taxes collected exclusively for the social security program should not be spent on any other program.
  - (3) Social security benefits are expected to consistently exceed social security payroll taxes starting in 2013.
  - (4) Congress should avoid increasing taxes, increasing borrowing, raising the retirement age, or cutting social security cost-of-living adjustments to pay social security benefits.
  - (5) Negotiable treasury bonds are safe, real assets that can be sold for cash when income to the social security trust funds is not sufficient to pay benefits for seniors in 2013.
- (b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—
  - (1) the amount by which social security payroll taxes exceed social security benefits paid shall be invested in negotiable treasury bonds issued by the United States Government and should not be counted as surplus dollars; and
  - (2) such negotiable Treasury bonds should be redeemable at any time at the purchase price.

### **SEC. 202. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX RELIEF.**

- (a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that this concurrent resolution dedicates \$150,000,000,000 over 5 years to reduce the tax burden on American families.
- (b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that these funds should be used to—
  - (1) provide across-the-board tax relief by expanding the 15 percent tax bracket by 15 percent for married individuals (whether filing a joint or separate return), heads of households, and unmarried individuals;
  - (2) eliminate the marriage penalty by making the joint income threshold exactly double that of the individual income threshold in all tax brackets and by making the standard deduction for joint filers exactly double that of individual filers;
  - (3) restore the 12-month holding period on capital gains; and
  - (4) eliminate the “death tax”.

### **SEC. 203. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE BUDGET SURPLUS.**

- (a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:
  - (1) The Congressional Budget Office in its Spring projections has underestimated the revenues collected by the Federal Government for the last 3 years.

(2) The United States is experiencing remarkable economic growth with no signs of an economic slowdown because the Federal Government is borrowing less from the private sector.

(3) Revenues to the Federal Government are growing at an annual rate far greater than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(4) The Federal Government will likely receive significantly more revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003 than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(5) Revenues received above and beyond those projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998 should not be spent to create more ineffective Washington programs.

(6) Additional revenues come from American families who are forced to give far too much of their hard-earned income to the Federal Government.

(7) Working Americans deserve to keep more of their income instead of sending it to Washington, D.C., for Congress to spend.

(8) Congress irresponsibly spent more than it received over the last 30 years, creating \$5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt.

(9) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the social security trust funds.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) any additional revenues collected by the Federal Government above and beyond the Congressional Budget Office March 1998 projections for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 should be divided equally and used to reduce taxes on American families and to pay off the \$5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt, prioritizing social security;

(2) such tax reductions should be enacted in the following order—

(A) expand education individual retirement accounts;

(B) index capital gains to the rate of inflation;

(C) immediate 100 percent deduction for health insurance premiums for employees and self-employed;

(D) eliminate social security earnings limit;

(E) repeal 1993 tax increase on social security benefits;

(F) repeal the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations; and

(G) permanently extend the research and development tax credit; and

(3) efforts to repay the Federal debt should begin by replacing the nonnegotiable Treasury bonds, in the social security trust fund with marketable Treasury bills redeemable at any time for the purchase price.

**SEC. 204. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAXES AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) American taxpayers pay too much in taxes to support a Federal Government which is too large.

(2) Taxpayers should benefit from any changes in law which reduce Federal Government spending.

(3) Current law prohibits savings from reduced discretionary spending from being passed along to the American people through a reduction in their tax burden.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that budget laws should be changed to allow discretionary spending reductions to be dedicated to tax relief.

**SEC. 205. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PUTTING SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President has encouraged the Congress to put social security first by not spending expected unified budget surpluses, though the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the President's budget for fiscal year 1999 does spend unified budget surpluses.

(2) The Congress currently has no method for dedicating savings from amendments to appropriation bills for the purpose of putting social security first.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Congress should establish a procedure that would allow amendments to appropriation bills to dedicate all budget savings to the President's plan to put social security first.

**SEC. 206. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EDUCATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in the United States should be the best students in the world.

(2) Quality education for our children will ensure the United States can compete effectively in the global marketplace.

(3) Today's students must learn the knowledge and skills which will lead the world in the next century.

(4) Involving parents in the education of their children increases children's success at school.

(5) Recent studies by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development show that increased parental involvement in children's lives leads to fewer teen pregnancies, less drug use, lower crime rates, and improved learning.

(6) Education is, and should remain, primarily a State and local responsibility.

(7) It is important to let community members offer suggestions to improve academic achievement within local schools.

(8) The Federal role in education has failed to produce the desired results.

(9) Federal regulations and paperwork consume too much of teachers' and administrators' time and energy, as well as taxpayer dollars which could be used to improve education.

(10) Creating a national testing program would increase the Federal burden on local schools.

(11) State, local, and private schools deserve flexibility which will allow them to meet the educational needs of children.

(12) Increasing the role of parents, teachers, and local community members will improve local schools.

(13) There is not a significant relationship between Federal education spending and academic achievement.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—



(1) the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies should spend at least 95 percent of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms;

(2) the Goals 2000 program should be terminated, and funds should be given directly to States and local school districts;

(3) the Congress should enact legislation to prevent the development and administration of a national testing program; and

(4) the Department of Education should limit its role in education to functions which cannot be performed by State or local school officials.

**SEC. 207. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SCHOOL CHOICE FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in our Nation's capital deserve to have the best education available.

(2) Many parents in the District of Columbia would prefer to send their children to the school of their choice, whether public, private, religious, or home.

(3) Allowing parents to evaluate and choose the proper school for their children gives them an invested interest in helping their children succeed.

(4) Giving children an opportunity to attend the school which best meets their needs will best prepare them for the future.

(5) Letting parents choose a school which reflects the moral or religious beliefs of their children will enhance the children's character and learning experience.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that there should be a Federal pilot program to provide low-income children in the District of Columbia with the opportunity to attend the public, private, religious, or home school of their parents' choice.

**SEC. 208. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Partial-birth abortions allow a child to be delivered until only its head remains in the birth canal.

(2) Partial-birth abortions involve piercing the child's skull and removing its brain.

(3) A large majority of Americans object to partially delivering a child and then killing it.

(4) Both Houses of Congress have consistently supported legislation to ban partial-birth abortions.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that partial-birth abortions should be banned in the United States unless such a procedure is needed to save the life of the mother.

**SEC. 209. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED PROMOTION OF ABORTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Title X of the Public Health Service Act was enacted to help reduce the unplanned pregnancy rate, especially among teenagers.

(2) Title X has not only failed to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate, out-of-wedlock births, and sexually transmitted diseases, it has made these problems worse.

(3) Taxpayer-funded title X family planning clinics are currently required to counsel pregnant girls and women about all of their “pregnancy management options”, including abortion.

(4) Title X clinics also require clinic staff, following such “counseling,” to refer girls and women who want an abortion to clinics that perform them.

(5) Many of these abortion clinics are operated by the same organizations that operate title X clinics.

(6) The United States Government through title X is using taxpayer dollars to subsidize activities destructive to human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that taxpayer dollars should not be used to subsidize abortion or organizations that promote or perform abortions.

**SEC. 210. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TITLE X FUNDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The title X of the Public Health Service Act family planning program provides contraceptives, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual counseling to minors without parental consent or notification.

(2) Almost 1,500,000 American minors receive title X family planning services each year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that organizations or businesses which receive funds through Federal programs should obtain parental consent or confirmation of parental notification before contraceptives are provided to a minor.

**SEC. 211. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONTROL PROGRAMS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) There is international consensus that under no circumstances should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

(2) The United States provides the largest percentage of population control assistance among donor nations.

(3) The activities of private organizations supported by United States taxpayers are a reflection of United States priorities in developing countries, and United States funds allow these organizations to expand their programs and influence.

(4) The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) recently signed a 4-year, \$20,000,000 contract with the People's Republic of China (PRC) which persists in coercing its people to obtain abortions and undergo involuntary sterilizations.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support international family planning programs;

(2) if the Congress is unwilling to stop supporting international family planning programs with taxpayer dollars, the Congress should limit such support to organizations that certify they will not perform, or lobby for the legalization of, abortions in other countries; and

(3) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support the United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA) if it is conducting activities in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the PRC's population control program continues to utilize coercive abortion.

**SEC. 212. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Human life is a precious resource which should not be created or destroyed simply for scientific experiments.

(2) A human embryo is a human being that must be accorded the moral status of a person from the time of fertilization.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that Congress should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for the creation of human embryos for research purposes and research in which human embryos are knowingly destroyed.

**SEC. 213. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN CLONING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Scientists around the world are actively participating in experiments which attempt to clone animals.

(2) Several of these experiments have succeeded in creating genetic clones of animals.

(3) The technology used in such experiments could be used to create genetically identical human beings;

(4) It is unethical and immoral to experiment with the creation of human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that any research on the cloning of humans should be prohibited by Federal law.

**SEC. 214. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TRADITIONAL MARRIAGES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Traditional marriages consist of one man and one woman.

(2) Strong families are the cornerstone of our society and our country.

(3) Children benefit from strong families.

(4) The Congress passed and the President signed into law legislation defining marriage as the union between one man and one woman for purposes of Federal programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that future legislation and regulations should recognize the importance of the traditional family in the United States.

**SEC. 215. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government's involvement in funding for the arts has become increasingly controversial.

(2) Millions of United States taxpayers have been forced to support both artists and organizations to which they object.

(3) The National Endowment for the Arts, despite congressional instructions to avoid controversial subject matters, continues to subsidize offensive art.

(4) More than 99 percent of funding for the arts is obtained from private sources.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts should be eliminated.

**SEC. 216. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FOREIGN AID.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The nation of Israel has been a reliable and dependable ally to the United States.

(2) The United States' support for Israel is vital to achieving peace in the Middle East.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that aid to Israel should not be reduced.

**SEC. 217. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) One of the most basic human rights is the right to religious freedom.

(2) The United States has a strong history of protecting individuals' right to religious liberty and encouraging other countries to do the same.

(3) Recent reports indicate that several countries continue to persecute individuals based on their religious beliefs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the United States should encourage other countries to protect religious freedom and allow their citizens to practice the faith that they choose without retribution.

Amend the title so as to read: "A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003."

---

**2. AN AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, OR A DESIGNEE, DEBATABLE FOR 60 MINUTES**

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,321,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,341,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,379,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,436,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,491,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: – \$900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: – \$200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$700,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,420,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,463,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,503,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,537,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,611,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,403,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,445,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,484,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,501,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,578,300,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$82,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$104,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$104,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$64,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$87,300,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,582,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,756,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$5,926,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$6,059,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$6,211,100,000,000.

### SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$274,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$280,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$269,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$18,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,000,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$23,200,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$23,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$4,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$51,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$52,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$44,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$53,500,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$46,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$54,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$46,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$56,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$48,900,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$64,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$63,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$65,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$64,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$66,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$64,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$69,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$145,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$143,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$151,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$151,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$159,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$159,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$166,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$167,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:



- (A) New budget authority, \$177,600,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$178,600,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$209,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$210,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$221,510,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$220,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$239,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$242,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$251,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$248,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$273,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$273,400,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$246,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$247,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$259,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$258,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$270,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$268,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$280,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$291,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$288,900,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,600,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$44,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$44,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$45,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$46,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$47,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$47,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$49,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$49,800,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$24,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$25,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$296,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$296,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$297,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$297,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$296,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$296,400,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$296,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$296,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$297,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$297,800,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$2,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$1,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$1,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$2,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$3,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$3,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$800,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$37,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$37,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$39,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$39,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$43,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$43,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$51,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$51,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2003:
    - (A) New budget authority, – \$42,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, – \$42,700,000,000.

#### **SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$0 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$40,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall re-

port changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$212,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$1,045,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$707,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$2,765,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$86,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and increase outlays by \$3,443,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$381,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$437,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$892,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

**SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

**SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TOTAL BUDGET SURPLUSES AND SOCIAL SECURITY.**

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The total budget surplus should be reserved until the Congress and the President enact comprehensive measures providing for the long-term solvency of Social Security, while preserving its core protections for present and future generations of American families.

(2) There should be established within the Treasury a “Save Social Security First Reserve Fund” to be used to save budget surpluses until a reform measure is enacted to ensure the long-term solvency of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds. The Secretary of the Treasury should pay into the account at the end of each fiscal year an amount equal to the surplus, if any, in the total budget of the United States Government for that fiscal year. Balances in that account should be invested in Treasury securities and interest earnings should be credited to the account.

**SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR POTENTIAL TOBACCO LEGISLATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to promote smoking prevention and cessation, curbs cigarette smoking among teenagers, makes payments to the States to mitigate the costs incurred of treating smoking-related illnesses, provides support to tobacco farmers, makes payments to other claimants against tobacco companies, or funds Federal medical research, within such a committee's jurisdiction, if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, and if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed legislation) the deficits in this resolution for—

- (1) fiscal year 1999; and
- (2) the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(b) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) **FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND (MEDICARE PART A TRUST FUND).**—Congress intends that any tobacco proceeds not used for increased funding under subsection (a) should be deposited in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established under section 1817 of the Social Security Act).

**SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

- (1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;
- (2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;
- (3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment in lieu of traditional income support and to assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;
- (4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in carrying out its reconciliation instructions pursuant to this concurrent resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means should include the text of H.R. 2849 (the Assets for Independence Act) in its submission to the House Committee on the Budget.

**SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.**

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should consider legislation this session that would establish a 3-year demonstration project providing medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.**

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies and medicare beneficiaries;

(2) if home health care is threatened and further reduced, health care costs to Federal and State governments, as well as families, may rise to cover more expensive post-hospital and long-term care;

(3) the committees of jurisdiction should initiate a revision of the interim payment system, paying particular attention to providing a more gradual reduction in home health care costs and additional time for home health care agencies to adjust to lower rates and reimbursements;

(4) due to the critical nature of this issue, Congress should enact an equitable and fair revision of the interim payment system before the adjournment of the 105th Congress; and

(5) the Health Care Financing Administration should fully implement by October 1, 1999, the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.**

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should accommodate high priority tax relief of approximately \$30,000,000,000 over 5 years within legislation that fully offsets revenues lost by closing or restricting unwarranted tax benefits. Such tax relief should—

(1) accommodate the revenue effects of improving rights for medical patients and providers in managed care health plans;

(2) expand tax credits to alleviate the costs of child care for families;

(3) reduce financing costs for primary and secondary public school modernization;

(4) extend long-supported and previously renewed tax benefits that will soon expire such as the Work Opportunity and Research and Experimentation credits; and

(5) mitigate tax code "marriage penalties" in a manner at least equal in scope to the 1995 tax relief provision of H.R. 2491.

Amend the title so as to read: “A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.”.

